



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/921,844	08/03/2001	Gary K. Michelson	101.0084-01000	8295
22882	7590	12/17/2007	EXAMINER	
MARTIN & FERRARO, LLP 1557 LAKE O' PINES STREET, NE HARTVILLE, OH 44632			SNOW, BRUCE EDWARD	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		3738		
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/17/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/921,844	MICHELSON, GARY K.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Bruce E. Snow	3738

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/9/07.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1, 131, 219 and their depending claims is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 1 and its depending claims is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 131, 219 and their depending claims is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1/09/07 have been fully considered. The Examiner appreciates applicant's submission of Exhibit A, pages 1 and 2, which helped explain the current claim language and overcome the rejection under 112, second paragraph. The amendment to the specification is also noted overcoming the objection to the specification. The Examiner accepts the language used in claim 219. However, claim 131 describing an included angle greater than 90 degree is new matter in both the claims and specification.

Regarding the rejection of at least claim 219 using the Paul et al reference, applicant argues:

Figs. 1, 4, and 6 of Paul show that the included angle between two converging sides of the perimeter of the forward facet proximate the peak of tooth 12 is identical to the included angle between two converging sides of the perimeter of the rearward facet proximate the peak of tooth 12. Fig. 9 of Paul only shows the included angle between two converging sides of the perimeter of the forward facet proximate peak of tooth 12 and does not show the included angle between two converging sides of the perimeter of the rearward facet proximate the peak.

The Examiner notes that applicant is only referring to figures 1, 4, and 6 which show a pyramid-shape projection with equal facets and a square base, but fails to note the entire teaching of the reference showing the pyramid-shape can be slanted. When the pyramid-shaped projections have a saw tooth shape as shown in figures 9, 10A and 11, the base is rectangular. Because the rearward facet is shorter, meet at the same tip

as the forward facet, and has the same width, the included angle of the sides at the tip has to be larger for the rearward facet than the forward facet.

Specification

The amendment filed 10/09/07 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: an included angle that is larger than 90 degrees. Applicant specification does not indicate that the drawings are to scale. Further, a single drawing can only teach a single included angle between the sides, not a range of "greater than 90 degree".

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 131 and its depending claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant specification

does not indicate that the drawings are to scale. Further, a single drawing can only teach a single included angle between the sides, not a range of "greater than 90 degree".

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1 and its depending claims are allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000.

Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 131 and its depending claims (at least 131, 133, 135, 137-145, 205, 206, 213-215, 272-276) and are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Fraser et al (6,592,624).

Fraser et al teaches a spinal implant comprising a plurality of projections 18 as shown in figures 1 and 1C formed on the upper and lower surfaces of the implant. The projections are slanted towards the trailing end, therefore, having a first facing facet 32 which is longer than a second facet 34 opposite of the first facet, and the slope of the second facet 34 being steeper as shown in figure 1C.

The second facet 34 having a perimeter, at least with a first side and a second side (generally 38 and 40 in figure 1A), said first and second sides of said perimeter being in a convergent relationship to each other having an included angle greater than 90 degrees therebetween. Note that the width Wf (figure 1A) can be 1-4 mm and the

height (figure 1B) can be 0.1 - 5mm; with a width of 4 mm and a height of 0.1, the included angle at the tip would be much greater than 90 degrees.

Many of applicant's dependent claims claim a wide range of limitations, for example, elements/materials/shapes/tools/etc which lack criticality in the specification, the use of any limitations in lieu of those used in the references solves no stated problem and produces no benefits and would have been an obvious matter of design choice for someone skilled in the art. Additionally, these limitations are well known in the prosthetic art and would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill.

Additionally, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill to have used any bone growth material known in the art or to have constructed the implant from any material known in the art for their known properties and characteristics.

Finally, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have used the projects of Paul et al on any known vertebrae implant to provide anchoring.

Claim 219 and its depending claims (at least 219, 228-255, 277-284) and are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Paul et al (6,258,125).

Paul et al teaches a spinal implant comprising a plurality of pyramid-shaped projections 12, as shown in figures 1, 9, 10A, and 11, formed on the upper and lower surfaces of the implant; see 3:42. The projections are slanted towards the trailing end, therefore, having a forward facing facet which is longer than a rearward facet and the

slope of the rearward being steeper. The projections further include side facets and a generally rectangular base.

It is the Examiner's interpretation that claims 131 and 219 no longer require the rearward facet having a negative direction of inclination or a portion of the projection extending outside of the perimeter of the base.

Regarding claim 219, the projections are pyramid-shaped thus having a square base as shown in figure 1. When the pyramid-shaped projections have a saw tooth shape as shown in figures 9, 10A and 11, the base is rectangular. Because the rearward facet is shorter, meet at the same tip as the forward facet, and has the same width, the included angle of the sides at the tip has to be larger for the rearward facet than the forward facet.

Many of applicant's dependent claims claim a wide range of limitations, for example, elements/materials/shapes/tools/etc which lack criticality in the specification, the use of any limitations in lieu of those used in the references solves no stated problem and produces no benefits and would have been an obvious matter of design choice for someone skilled in the art. Additionally, these limitations are well known in the prosthetic art and would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill.

Additionally, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill to have used any bone growth material known in the art or to have constructed the implant from any material known in the art for their known properties and characteristics.

Finally, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have used the projects of Paul et al on any known vertebrae implant to provide anchoring.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bruce E. Snow whose telephone number is (571) 272-4759. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott can be reached on (571) 272-4754. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

bes



BRUCE SNOW
PRIMARY EXAMINER